IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of:	Julien T. Nguyen	)	Art Unit:	2176
Appl. No.:	10/764,835	)	Confirmation no.:	6888
Filed:	1/26/2004	)	Examiner:	James T. Debrow

Title: Multimedia Communication and Presentation

Filed via EFS-Web
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

REVISED APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Applicant respectfully submits this Revised Appeal Brief in the appeal from the Office Action dated April 12, 2007, (hereinafter referred to as the "Final Office Action") in which all claims were finally rejected. Applicant's Notice of Appeal was filed on July 12, 2007. Applicant's Appeal Brief was first filed on September 12, 2007. A Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (the "Notice") was mailed to applicant on November 26, 2007. This Revised Appeal Brief is filed in response thereto. Specifically, this Revised Appeal Brief: (1) adds to the Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter Section a table for each of the appealed independent

claims which refers by page and line number to correspondence between the claim limitations and examples of those limitations in the specification; and (2) corrects an error in the identification of appealed claims (corrects the omission of "61" therefrom as originally filed). This Revised Appeal Brief is being filed within one month of the mailing of the Notice, and accordingly no fee is due in association with this filing.

Table of Contents

1. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Mount Hamilton Partners, LLC, the assignee of all right, title, and interest in and to the present application and any patent issuing thereon.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences.

3. Status of the Claims

Claims 61 to 78 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 to 60 were previously cancelled. Claims 61 to 78 were finally rejected in the Final Office Action and currently stand finally rejected. Claims 61 to 78 are appealed.

4. Status of Amendments

No amendments after the Final Office Action have been submitted. All prior amendments have been entered.

5. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present invention is, in essence, a method and corresponding system which replaces identified portions of a written (text-based) communication with multimedia objects (sound, pictures, animation, etc.) corresponding to those identified portions of text. The replacements are made in context, such that the multimedia objects appear within the remaining written communication. (Application, page 3 line 21 to page 4 line 3.) According to one embodiment of the present invention, in the context of a standard, text-based inter-client chat, certain words, phrases or punctuation within a text sentence or sentence fragment are identified in context, and replaced within the text sentences by images, sounds, executable code, etc. to provide a more engaging chat experience than pure text. Accordingly, a user can create a multimedia message, such as a multimedia chat message, using textual input alone.

The multimedia objects can be grouped according to a theme. In such a case, all objects replacing text portions have that theme in common. That is, an object intended to replace an identified portion of written text is automatically selected from a plurality of such objects depending on the selected theme. (Application, page 3, lines 9 to 11.) Thus, the replacement of text portions with multimedia objects can impart a mood or feeling to the overall, combined text and multimedia communication. For example, a message may take on a "Western" theme, or a "Romantic" theme depending upon the nature of the collection of multimedia objects selected to replace text portions. (Application, page 3, lines 13 to 14).

The relationship between certain test and multimedia objects intending to replace that text may be user-editable. A user may be provided with a simple mechanism for making associations between text portions and multimedia objects intended to replace those text portions. See, e.g., application page 15, lines 4 to 10.

Finally, the multimedia objects may have a hierarchy relating to their complexity, demands on the user-side display device and/or memory, etc. The multimedia object highest in the hierarchy which the user-side device is capable of processing and displaying may be selected for text replacement. For example, text word "flower" may be replaced by one of the following, from low to high in the hierarchy, depending on the capabilities of the user-side display device: a low resolution image of a flower, a high resolution image of a flower, an animation including a flower, an animation with sound and including a flower. See, e.g., application page 12, line 20, to page 13, line 6.

Given this concise explanation of the claimed subject matter, the subject of the 2 independent claims (61 and 70) to be considered in this appeal, applicant provides reference to corresponding sections of the specification as follows:

Claim limitation	Example of corresponding disclosure in specification by page and line number
61. A method, comprising the steps of:	
receiving a set of sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions;	Page 8, lines 5-7
detecting whether a mnemonic name is present in said sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions, said mnemonic name being associated with one of a set of multimedia objects;	Page 8, lines 6-10 (see also page 7, lines 4-11 for a discussion of mnemonic)
when said mnemonic name is detected in said set of sequences, replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object in said set of sequences; and	Page 8, lines 10-12
wherein said set of multimedia objects are associated with an ensemble, said ensemble having a set of ensemble properties.	Page 13, line 19 to page 14, line 12

Claim limitation	Example of corresponding disclosure in specification by page and line number
70. A system, comprising:	
a database having a set of mnemonic names, each associated with at least one corresponding multimedia object;	Page 7, lines 1-2; Fig. 1, element 114
an input device for a set of sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions;	Page 6, lines 15-19; Fig. 1, element 112
a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of replacing said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object in said set of sequences; and	Page 8, lines 6-10 (see also page 7, lines 4-11 for a discussion of mnemonic); Fig. 1, element 110
an associating mechanism capable of associating an ensemble with a set of said multimedia objects, said ensemble having a set of ensemble properties;	Page 13, line 19 to page 14, line 20; Fig. 1, element 110
wherein each said multimedia object has a set of editable properties.	Page 13, lines 19-21

6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Are claims 61, 62, and 71 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maurille (USP 6,484,196) in view of Skelly (6,064,383)?

2. Are claims 63-70 and 72-78 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Maurille (USP 6,484,196) in view of Skelly (USP 6,064,383) and further in view of Liles et al. (USP 5,880,731)?

7. Argument

A.   Claims 61, 62, and 71: 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under Maurille and Skelly

Claims 61, 62, and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille (USP 6,484,196) in view of Skelly (USP 6,064,383). Specifically, the Final Office Action asserts that Maurille discloses, in the context of a chat session:

> *receiving a set of sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions.*

The Final Office Action further asserts that Skelly discloses:

> *detecting whether a mnemonic name is present in said sequence of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions, said mnemonic name being associated with one of a set of multimedia objects;*

> *when said mnemonic is detected in said sequence, replacing said mnemonic name with said multimedia object in said set of sequences; and*

> *wherein said set of multimedia objects are associated with an ensemble, said ensemble having a set of ensemble properties.*

The Final Office Action thus asserts that the combination of Maurille and Skelly teaches all of the limitations of claims 61, 62, and 71.

In response, applicant argues first that Skelly does not teach each of the claim elements attributed to it in the Final Office Action. Specifically, it is argued that Skelly fails to teach "replacing said mnemonic name with said multimedia object in said set of sequences". It then will follow that the combination of Maurille and Skelly cannot teach each and every limitation

found in claims 61, 62, and 71, and thus no _prima facie_ case of obviousness has been made as to those claims.

i.   The combination of Maurille and Skelly fails to teach "replacing said mnemonic name with said multimedia object in said set of sequences"

According to one embodiment of the present invention, in the context of a standard, text-based inter-client chat, certain words, phrases or punctuation are actually replaced within the text sentences by multimedia objects (images, sounds, executable code, etc.) to provide a more engaging chat experience than pure text. That is, multimedia objects are caused to appear embedded within the test sentences at the locations at which the text they replace were originally found. To this point, claim 61 contains the limitation "when said mnemonic name is detected in said set of sequences, replacing said mnemonic name with said multimedia object in said set of sequences". (Claim 61, lines 7-8, emphasis added. See also application, page 8, lines 5 to 12.)

It is admitted in the Office Action that Maurille fails to teach or suggest replacing a mnemonic name with a multimedia object, as claimed. It is, however, asserted in the Office Action that Skelly teaches such a feature at col. 1, lines 53-65. It is this proposition with which applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to the cited portion of Skelly, "upon finding an emoticon, the system modifies the expression (i.e., assigns a bitmap for the character that captures the expression) of the character to indicate happiness or sadness, respectively." (Skelly, col. 1, lines 53 to 57.) That is, text elements are recognized and converted into an appearance of a comic strip element

associated with the text. Accordingly, see also the text at from Skelly at col. 1, lines 59 to 65: "The system also searches the input text to identity (sic) acronyms that may provide clues as to the desired appearance for the character (i.e., the desired gesture and expression). For example, the acronym LOL is short for "laughing out loud. Upon finding LOL in the text, the system concludes that the character should be laughing and generates a laughing appearance for the character."

Importantly, there is nothing in Skelly which suggests that from within a sequence of characters, when a desired portion (referred to as a mnemonic name) of that sequence is detected, "replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object <u>in said set of sequences</u>." (Claim 61, lines 7 to 8, emphasis added.) That is, Skelly fails to teach identifying a desired portion of a sequence of characters and replacing that portion with a multimedia object such that <u>the multimedia object appears in the sequence of characters that are not replaced</u>. Indeed, the disclosure of Skelly fails to <u>replace</u>[1] any text whatsoever. Rather, identified text is merely used to assist in decisions regarding the appearance of a comic strip element associated with the text.

"To establish <u>prima facie</u> obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. <u>In re Royka</u>, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accord. M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). The burden is on the Examiner in the first instance to explain how the prior art teaches or suggests each claim limitation. <u>Ex parte Levy</u>, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461 (BPAI 1990).

Despite the conclusory statement in the Office Action that Skelly teaches replacing portions of text with multimedia objects within a text sentence, applicant has demonstrated that

it does not. Thus, since neither Maurille nor Skelly teach or suggest such a limitation, the combination of those references cannot teach or suggest such a limitation. Accordingly, the invention of claim 61 is patentably distinct from the cited combination of Maurille and Skelly. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 61 be revered in this appeal.

As claim 62 directly depends from and contains all of the limitations of claim 61, it must be patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the reasons that claim 61 are distinct therefrom. Accordingly, applicant also respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 62 be revered in this appeal.

Claim 71 depends from and contains all of the limitations of claim 70. Claim 70 is discussed first. Claim 70 contains the limitation "a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of <u>replacing</u> said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object <u>in said set of sequences</u>" (claim 70, lines 6-8, emphasis added). For the reasons enumerated above, the combination of Maurille and Skelly fail to teach or suggest such a limitation. Thus, claim 70 is patentably distinct from that combination of references, as is claim 71 by its dependence on claim 70.

For the sake of being explicit about our reasoning, by its dependence on claim 70, claim 71 contains the limitation "a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of <u>replacing</u> said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object <u>in said set of sequences</u>". The cited combination of references fails to teach such a limitation. As there is at least one limitation in claim 71 not taught or suggested by the combination of references, no <u>prima facie</u> case of obviousness has been made. <u>In re Royka</u>,

---

[1] Replace is defined as "Take the place of, become a substitute for" and "Fill the place of (a person or thing) with or

supra. Accordingly, applicant also respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 71 be revered in this appeal.

B.   Claims 63-70 and 72-78: 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under Maurille, Skelly, Liles

    i.   The combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles also fails to teach "replacing said mnemonic name with said multimedia object in said set of sequences"

Claims 63-70 and 72-78 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille (USP 6,484,196) in view of Skelly (USP 6,064,383) and further in view of Liles (USP 5,880,731). Applicant explains below that Liles further fails to teach or suggest _replacing_ a portion of a sequence of characters with a multimedia object _in the sequence of characters_, and that the invention of the base independent claims has not been shown by the combination of references. Applicant will then address the rejections of the individual claims.

As with the referenced portion of Skelly, Liles (same Assignee) is directed to a chat program in which participants are represented by characters (avatars) on screen. A user selects an avatar of choice. The system presents renderings of that avatar which convey information to supplement a chat communication. In particular, Liles is concerned with the selection of avatar gestures and features. Keywords are recognized or a selection interface provided allowing the system to create avatars with appropriate gestures or features.

However, there is nothing in Liles which teaches or suggests detecting a portion of a sequence of characters and _replacing_ that detected portion with a multimedia object _in the_

---

by a substitute." Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford Press, 2002.

sequence of characters. Those sections of Liles which reference chat text make it clear that such text is transmitted in full to the other participants. No replacement is made. See, e.g., col. 10, lines 2-25. Accordingly, each of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fail to teach or suggest detecting a portion of a sequence of characters and replacing that detected portion with a multimedia object in the sequence of characters, and accordingly the combination must fail to teach or suggest such a limitation.

Now, with respect to the rejections of the claims, we begin with a discussion of claim 61. As mentioned above, claim 61 contains the limitation "when said mnemonic name is detected in said set of sequences, replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object in said set of sequences" (claim 61, lines 7-8, emphasis added). However, it has also been shown above that the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, claim 61 is patentably distinct from the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles. Now, claims 63-69 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 61, and therefore contain all of the limitations of claim 61. Thus, claims 63-69 must be patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the reasons that claim 61 are distinct therefrom.

To be clear, by way of their dependence on claim 61, claims 63-69 contain the limitation that "when said mnemonic name is detected in said set of sequences, replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object in said set of sequences". This limitation is nowhere taught or suggested by the combination of cited references. As there is at least one limitation in each of claims 63-69 not taught or suggested by the references, no prima facie case of obviousness of those claims has been made. In re Royka, supra. Accordingly, for this reason applicant respectfully requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 63-69.

Similarly, claim 70 contains the limitation "a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of <u>replacing</u> said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object <u>in said set of sequences</u>" (claim 70, lines 6-8, emphasis added). However, we have shown above that the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, claim 70 is patentably distinct from the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles, and applicant respectfully request reversal of the final rejection of claim 70 on these grounds.

Furthermore, claims 72-78 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 70, and therefore contain all of the limitations of claim 70. Thus, claims 72-78 must be patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the reasons that claim 70 are distinct therefrom.

To be clear, by way of their dependence on claim 70, claims 72-78 contain the limitation "a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of <u>replacing</u> said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object <u>in said set of sequences</u>". This limitation is nowhere taught or suggested by the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles. As there is at least one limitation in claims 72-78 not taught or suggested by the cited combination of references, no <u>prima facie</u> case of obviousness has been made. <u>In re Royka</u>, supra. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 72-78.

In addition to the fact that the aforementioned claims are patentably distinct from the cited combination of references by way of their dependence on allowable independent claims, claims 63-70 and 72-78 are patentable in their own right. Certain of such limitations are addressed following, with the understanding that there may be additional bases on which these claims uniquely patentably distinguish from the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles.

ii.   The combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach a "theme being
        effective to select, for each multimedia object in said ensemble, one multimedia
        object from a set of multimedia object associated with said theme" (claims 63 and
        72)

Claim 63 (and similarly claim 72) introduces the concept of a theme: "the ensemble
properties include a theme, said theme being effective to select, for each multimedia object in
said ensemble, one multimedia object from a set of multimedia object associated with said
theme." (Claim 63, lines 2-4; claim 72, lines 1-4). Liles teaches that users may pick an avatar
to represent them in a chat session. The avatars may change depending upon the subject
matter of the chat session. (Liles, col. 6, lines 21-30.) Liles teaches that different avatars may
be presented to a user for selection depending upon the subject matter of the dialog. However,
Liles does not teach an ensemble of multimedia object associated with an avatar such that an
object is selected from that ensemble based on a theme. That is, Liles does not teach a "theme
being effective to select, for each multimedia object in said ensemble, one multimedia object
from a set of multimedia object associated with said theme." Accordingly, there are limitations
in claims 63 and 72 which are not taught by the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles.
Thus, no prima facie case of obviousness of those claims has been made in light of the cited
combination of references. In re Royka, supra. On this additional ground, applicant respectfully
requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 63 and 72.

iii.   The combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach ensemble properties editable in response to a set of "editing abbreviations" (claims 64, 65, 73 and 74)

With regard to claim 64 (and similarly claim 73), the ensemble properties are editable in response to a set of "editing abbreviations." (Claim 64, line 2; claim 73, line 2). And with regard to claim 65 (and similarly claim 74), the editing abbreviations comprise a "short sequence of keystrokes or mouse actions." (Claim 65, line 2; claim 74, line 2.)

Specifically, the present invention provides a user with a simple mechanism for making the association between portions of text and multimedia objects to replace those portions of text. (E.g., application, page 15, lines 4 to 10.) Liles does teach that the avatars are editable, such editing involving opening the bitmap file corresponding to the avatar in a paint program and modifying the bitmap as desired. (Liles, col. 7, lines 49 to 54.) However, it is respectfully asserted that use of a paint program is not an "editing abbreviation" (claim 64, line 2; claim 73, line 2) nor a "short sequence of keystrokes or mouse actions." (Claim 65, line 2; claim 74, line 2.) Accordingly, claims 64, 65, 73, and 74 contain limitations not taught by the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles, and thus no prima facie case of obviousness of those claims has been made. In re Royka, supra. On this additional ground, applicant respectfully requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 64, 65, 73 and 74.

iv.   The combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach presenting a multimedia object as a function of the nature of a recipient's device (claims 67 and 76)

Claim 67 (and similarly claim 76), is directed to presenting a multimedia object as a function of the nature of a recipient's device (e.g., automatically selecting one of a plurality of multimedia objects associated with a text portion to be replaced based on the capabilities of the receiving computer.) In the words of the claim: "conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to a capability of said recipient's presentation device, whereby said multimedia object is presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties." (Claim 67, lines 1-4; claim 76, lines 2-5.) That is, a hierarchy of multimedia objects can be associated with a portion of text to be replaced.   An example of such a hierarchy, from low to high demand on a user system, for replacing the word "flower" might be: a low resolution picture of a flower, a high resolution picture of a flower, and an animation representing a flower. (See, application, page 12, line 20 to page 13, line 6.) This claimed aspect of the present invention allows a user computer to decide which level within this hierarchy it is capable of displaying, and then selecting and displaying the appropriate multimedia object. This is very different than modifying an avatar's bitmap file in a paint program, cited in the Final Office Action (Final Office Action, page 9, citing Liles, col. 7 lines 43-65.) Accordingly, claims 67 and 76 contain limitations not taught by the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles, and no prima facie case of obviousness of those claims in light of that combination has been made. In re Royka, supra. On this additional ground, applicant respectfully requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 67 and 76.

v.   The combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles fails to teach making a decision regarding the replacement of a portion of text with a multimedia object based on the "time taken by said recipient to review the multimedia object" (claims 69 and 78)

Claim 69 (and similarly claim 78) is directed to making a decision regarding the replacement of a portion of text with a multimedia object based on the "time taken by said recipient to review the multimedia object." (Claim 69, lines 1 to 2; claim 78, lines 1 to 2.) While the Final Office Action asserts that this is taught by Liles at col. 7, lines 18-21, where it teaches a preview box, applicant finds nothing in Liles (or expressly identified in the Final Office Action) regarding making any decision based on a measure of user review time. Accordingly, claims 69 and 78 contain limitations not taught by the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles, and no prima facie case of obviousness of those claims in light of that combination has been made. In re Royka, supra. On this additional ground, applicant respectfully requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 69 and 78.

8. Summary and Conclusion

In summary, the applied reference fails to teach each limitation found in the rejected claims 61 to 78. Specifically, the combination of Maurille and Skelly as well as the combination of Maurille, Skelly, and Liles falls short of teaching or suggesting the present invention by failing to teach, inter alia:

(a) replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object in said set of sequences;

(b) a theme "being effective to select, for each multimedia object in said ensemble, one multimedia object from a set of multimedia object associated with said theme";

(c) ensemble properties editable in response to a set of "editing abbreviations";

(d) the editing abbreviations comprising a "short sequence of keystrokes or mouse actions";

(e) "conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to a capability of said recipient's presentation device, whereby said multimedia object is presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties"; and

(f) making a decision regarding the replacement of a portion of text with a multimedia object based on the "time taken by said recipient to review the multimedia object".

Applicant recognizes and appreciates the reasoning behind the rejections in the Final Office Action. However, for the foregoing reasons, the claims of the present application are asserted to be patentably distinct from the cited combinations of references. Thus, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully

requests reversal of the final rejection of claims 61 to 78, with a remand for the allowance thereof and issuance of the present application.

Oral hearing has been requested in this appeal. However, if the undersigned can personally answer any questions or assist with this case before such hearing, please telephone the undersigned at 650-941-4470.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan A. Small/
(e-signature)

343 2nd Street, Suite F
Los Altos, CA 94022

Jonathan A. Small
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,631
Telephone: 650-941-4470

Date: December 19, 2007

Claims Appendix

Claims 1-60 have previously been cancelled.

61. A method, comprising the steps of:

receiving a set of sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions;

detecting whether a mnemonic name is present in said sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions, said mnemonic name being associated with one of a set of multimedia objects;

when said mnemonic name is detected in said set of sequences, replacing said mnemonic name with said one multimedia object in said set of sequences; and

wherein said set of multimedia objects are associated with an ensemble, said ensemble having a set of ensemble properties.

62. A method as in claim 61, wherein said ensemble properties are effective to select among a set of alternative multimedia objects for each multimedia object in said set.

63. A method as in claim 61, wherein said ensemble properties include a theme, said theme being effective to select, for each multimedia object in said ensemble, one multimedia object from a set of multimedia objects associated with said theme.

64. A method as in claim 61, wherein said ensemble properties are editable in response to a set of editing abbreviations.

i

65. A method as in claim 64, wherein each said editing abbreviation comprises a relatively short sequence of keystrokes or mouse actions.

66. A method as in claim 61, further comprising the steps of:

communicating at least one of said ensemble properties to a recipient with an electronic chat message or an electronic mail message; and

presenting said multimedia object to said recipient in accordance with said at least one of said ensemble properties.

67. A method as in claim 66, further comprising the step of conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to a capability of said recipient's presentation device, whereby said multimedia object is presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties.

68. A method as in claim 66, further comprising the step of conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to an action by said recipient, whereby said multimedia object is presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties.

69. A method as in claim 68, wherein said action includes time taken by said recipient to review the multimedia object.

70. A system, comprising:

a database having a set of mnemonic names, each associated with at least one corresponding multimedia object;

an input device for a set of sequences of keystrokes, mouse actions, or keystrokes and mouse actions;

a detector capable of detecting at least one of said mnemonic names in said set of sequences and of replacing said mnemonic name with at least one corresponding multimedia object in said set of sequences; and

an associating mechanism capable of associating an ensemble with a set of said multimedia objects, said ensemble having a set of ensemble properties;

wherein each said multimedia object has a set of editable properties.

71. A system as in claim 70, wherein said ensemble properties are effective to select among a set of alternative multimedia objects for each multimedia object in said set.

72. A system as in claim 70, wherein said ensemble properties include a theme, said theme being effective to select, for each multimedia object in said ensemble, one multimedia object from a set of multimedia objects associated with said theme.

73. A system as in claim 70, wherein said ensemble properties are editable in response to a set of editing abbreviations.

74. A system as in claim 73, wherein each said editing abbreviation comprises a relatively short sequence of keystrokes or mouse actions.

75. A system as in claim 70, further comprising:

a communicating mechanism capable of sending at least one of said ensemble properties to a recipient with an electronic chat message or an electronic mail message; and

a presentation mechanism capable of presenting said multimedia objects to said recipient in accordance with said at least one of said ensemble properties.

76. A system as in claim 75, further comprising a mechanism capable of conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to a capability of said recipient's presentation device, whereby said multimedia objects are presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties.

77. A system as in claim 75, further comprising a mechanism capable of conditionally overriding at least one of said ensemble properties in response to an action by said recipient, whereby said multimedia objects are presented to said recipient in accordance with a different at least one of said ensemble properties.

78. A system as in claim 77, wherein said action comprises time taken by said recipient to review the multimedia objects.

Evidence Appendix

No additional evidence is being submitted with this appeal.

Related Proceedings Appendix

There are currently no proceedings related to this appeal.